

effects of the article, were false and fraudulent: "The fumes from evaporation after use in the hutch will satisfactorily combat colds and snuffles."

The information also charged a violation of the Insecticide Act of 1910, reported in notice of judgment no. 1297, published under that act. On May 18, 1934, a plea of guilty to both charges was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$10 on each of the two counts, together with costs of the action.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22610. Adulteration and misbranding of Fresca Antiseptic Powder. U. S. v. 58 Packages of Fresca Antiseptic Powder. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32259. Sample no. 65087-A.)

Examination of the drug preparation involved in this case showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling. Bacteriological examination showed that the article was not an antiseptic when used as directed.

On March 10, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 58 packages of Fresca Antiseptic Powder at Chicago, Ill., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about February 8, 1934, by the Fresca Co., from Lansing, Mich., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by this Department showed that it consisted essentially of boric acid, alum, and small amounts of phenol and oil of peppermint. Bacteriological examination showed that it was not antiseptic even when tested in solutions 10 times as strong as that recommended on the labeling.

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that its strength fell below the professed standard or quality under which it was sold, namely, "Antiseptic * * * For Feminine Hygiene."

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statements appearing in the labeling, were false and misleading: (Box) "Antiseptic Powder * * * For Feminine Hygiene"; (circular) "Antiseptic * * * 'An Antiseptic Powder for women is a boon' * * * The greatest wealth cannot buy a better antiseptic, Fresca * * * An antiseptic * * * Fresca is far superior to all other antiseptics. As an antiseptic." Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the box label and circular contained false and fraudulent statements regarding the use of the article in inflammations of the female generative tract, troubles peculiar to women, any trouble along the vaginal tract, vaginitis, leucorrhoea, social or venereal diseases, wounds, removing proud flesh, stopping discharge of pus, sleeplessness, catarrhal disease of the womb, piles, hemorrhoids, abscesses, wounds, athlete's foot, and ringworm.

On April 6, 1934, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

22611. Misbranding of Womanette. U. S. v. 35 Bottles and 23 Bottles of Womanette. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 32260. Sample nos. 61952-A, 61953-A.)

Examination of the drug preparation Womanette showed that it contained no ingredient or combination of ingredients capable of producing certain curative and therapeutic effects claimed in the labeling.

On March 12, 1934, the United States attorney for the Northern District of Texas, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 58 bottles of Womanette at Dallas, Tex., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by L. Wilzin, in part on or about January 2, 1934, from Leland, Miss., and in part on or about January 12, 1934, from Greenville, Miss., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Manufactured by the Capital Remedy Co., Incorporated, Jackson, Mississippi"; (wrapper) "Distributed by Bolton Medicine Co., Bolton, Miss."